

Building an entanglement measure on physical ground

D. Teresi, A. Napoli, A. Messina
*CNISM, MIUR and Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche ed Astronomiche,
 via Archirafi 36, 90123 Palermo, Italy,
 E-mail: messina@fisica.unipa.it*

We introduce on physical grounds a new measure of multipartite entanglement for pure states. The function we define is discriminant and monotone under LOCC and moreover can be expressed in terms of observables of the system.

PACS numbers:

Since the beginning of quantum mechanics, entanglement revealed to be a key concept for the understanding of the nature. Its link with the foundations of physics was immediately recognized, in particular in connection with the nonlocality property of quantum theory. In the last years moreover the interest toward this fundamental concept of Quantum Mechanics has grown also in view of its central role in many fields of contemporary physics, like quantum information theory or condensed matter physics. In the last decade, in particular, the fundamental question concerning how to *quantify* entanglement has received a lot of attention. To this end different measures of entanglement have been proposed with respect, in particular, to bipartite systems. On the contrary entanglement in multipartite systems remains an open and debated problem. In view of the complexity of such systems it cannot indeed be understood simply extending the tools adopted when bipartite entangled states are studied.

Consider a multipartite system composed by N not necessarily identical subsystems each one living in a finite dimensional Hilbert space. In this letter we introduce a new measure of entanglement for such systems in pure states called *General Entanglement* (GE). This quantity provides a measure of the entanglement present in the system independently on how it is distributed among the finitely many possible subsystems. The GE proves to be easily computable and reduces to Meyer and Wallach's Global Entanglement [1] when qubit systems are considered. A very important aspect is that the quantity we introduce has an immediate interpretation. Making indeed physical considerations of clear meaning we construct our new measure function directly starting from the concept of separability. The quantity we define is moreover characterized by many appealing properties making it very attractive both from a conceptual and an experimental point of view. As well known a pure state of a multipartite system is said to be completely separable if it can be written as tensor product of states of each subsystem. At the same time a state is separable with respect to an assigned subsystem if, and only if, no physical quantity of the subsystem under scrutiny can be changed acting on the rest of the system. Let thus consider a multipartite system in a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and focus on the single j -th subsystem. A projective measurement [2, 3] on the rest

of the system is defined as:

$$\mathcal{M}^j = \{\mathcal{P}_i = |\chi_i\rangle\langle\chi_i|\} \quad (1)$$

with

$$\sum_i \mathcal{P}_i = \mathbb{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_i = \mathbb{I}^{(j)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_i^{(r)} \quad (2)$$

In eq. (2) the projection operators $\mathcal{P}_i$ act on the Hilbert space of the total system whereas $\mathcal{P}_i^{(r)}$ act on the Hilbert space relative to the system obtained excluding the j -th subsystem from the total one.

As a result of the measurement the system initially in the state $\rho \equiv |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is projected, with probability p_i , onto the pure state ρ_i corresponding to the obtained outcome: $\rho \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}^j} \{p_i, \rho_i\}$. Thus, whatever the observable $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^{(j)} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{(r)}$ is, the quantity:

$$R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j), \mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) = (\text{Tr } \rho \mathcal{O} - \text{Tr } \rho_i \mathcal{O})^2 \quad (3)$$

is zero if ρ is separable with respect to the subsystem j . This statement is in addition true whatever the chosen projective measurement $\mathcal{M}^j$ is. If, on the contrary, the quantity $R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j), \mathcal{P}_i}(\rho)$ is zero for any $\mathcal{O}^{(j)}$, $\mathcal{M}^j$ and for any outcome i , we may claim with certainty that the state of the j -th subsystem is not correlated with the rest of the system in any way. Under this condition ρ must be separable with respect to the subsystem j ; thus, if this property is true for every subsystem, the state must be completely separable. Guided from these considerations we introduce the quantities:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) = \sum_i p_i \max_{\mathcal{O} \in \Omega} R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j), \mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) \quad (4)$$

where Ω is the set of all the observables $\mathcal{O}^{(j)} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{(r)}$, $\mathcal{O}^{(j)}$ acting on the state space of the j -th subsystem. By definition this quantity gives an estimation of the *average departure* from the separability condition. $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ is indeed equal to zero with certainty only if the state is separable with respect to j . Let's however observe that it goes to infinity in the opposite case being $R_{\alpha \mathcal{O}}^{(j), \mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) = \alpha^2 R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j), \mathcal{P}_i}(\rho)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Confining ourselves however to the set Ω of all the normalized observables, with respect to a prefixed norm, the quantity $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ becomes finite. Let's

moreover observe that since $R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) = R_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho)$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O} - r\mathbb{I}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho)$ does not depend on $\text{Tr } \mathcal{O}$. Thus, without loss of generality we put

$$\Omega = \{\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^{(j)} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{(r)}, \mathcal{O}^\dagger = \mathcal{O}, \text{Tr } \mathcal{O} = 0, \|\mathcal{O}\| = 1\} \quad (5)$$

The quantity $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ evaluated in the set Ω defined by (5), gives an estimation of the degree of entanglement existing between the j -th subsystem and the rest of the system. In other words the greater $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ is, the greater is the influence on the j -th subsystem stemming from the measurement on the rest of the system. Thus, when a system composed by N subsystems is in a pure state $\rho \equiv |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, we are naturally guided to adopt as a measurement of entanglement the quantity

$$E_g(\rho) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \max_{\mathcal{M}^j} \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) \quad (6)$$

In what follows we will refer to this measure as *General Entanglement*. By definition $E_g(\rho)$ may be evaluated for pure states of arbitrarily large multipartite systems, whose N constituents have finite dimensional Hilbert spaces. It is important to stress that, differently from the Global entanglement of Meyer and Wallach [1] or its generalizations proposed by Rigolin et al. [4], our definition does not require that such Hilbert spaces have the same dimensions. We now prove that GE is a *good* entanglement measure for pure states [5, 6, 7, 8]. To this end we begin demonstrating the following

Theorem 1 *General Entanglement is discriminant, that is $E_g(\rho) = 0 \iff \rho$ is completely separable.*

Proof: ρ completely separable implies $E_g(\rho) = 0$ being $R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) = 0$ whatever the observable $\mathcal{O}$ and the subsystem j are. Conversely, $E_g(\rho) = 0$ implies $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) = 0$ whatever j and $\mathcal{M}^j$ are. Since in addition in correspondence to an outcome i with $p_i \neq 0$ $\text{Tr } \rho \mathcal{O} = \text{Tr } \rho_i \mathcal{O}$ for any $\mathcal{O}$, then $\rho^{(j)} \equiv \text{Tr}_r \rho$ and $\rho_i^{(j)} \equiv \text{Tr}_r \rho_i$ coincide. But, ρ_i is pure and separable with respect to j ; thus $\rho_i^{(j)}$, and therefore $\rho^{(j)}$, is pure too. Then ρ is separable with respect to j . Since such a property holds for any subsystem j , the state $\rho \equiv |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is completely separable. $\square$

Another remarkable features of our GE is its invariance under local unitary operations. It is indeed possible to prove the following

Theorem 2 $E_g(\rho) = E_g(U\rho U^\dagger)$, with $U^\dagger = U^{-1}$ and $U = U^{(1)} \otimes U^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes U^{(N)}$

Proof: Putting $\tilde{\rho} = U\rho U^\dagger$ for every admissible measurement $\mathcal{M}^j = \{\mathcal{P}_i\}$ consider the *transformed* measurement $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^j \equiv \{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i = U\mathcal{P}_i U^\dagger\}$ satisfying (1)). It is immediate to convince oneself that since

$$\tilde{p}_i = \text{Tr } \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i = p_i \quad \tilde{\rho}_i = \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_i} \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i \tilde{\rho} = U \rho_i U^\dagger \quad (7)$$

then

$$R_{U\mathcal{O}U^\dagger}^{(j),\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i}(\tilde{\rho}) = R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) \quad (8)$$

so that

$$\max_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \in \tilde{\Omega}} R_{\tilde{\mathcal{O}}}^{(j),\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i}(\tilde{\rho}) = \max_{\mathcal{O} \in \Omega} R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) \quad (9)$$

Thus $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^j}^{(j)}(\tilde{\rho}) = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ and, therefore, $E_g(\rho) = E_g(U\rho U^\dagger)$. $\square$

To obtain an explicit expression for the GE we normalize the observables of the set Ω with respect to the *trace scalar product*:

$$(A, B) = \text{Tr}(AB) \implies \|A\|^2 = \text{Tr } A^2 \quad (10)$$

This choice of the set Ω allows us to prove that GE is monotone under LOCC. To demonstrate this remarkable property it is convenient to prove in advance the following general Lemma:

Lemma 1 *Let $\{A_k\}$ be an orthonormal basis (with respect to (10)) in the vectorial space of traceless hermitian $D \times D$ matrices. For every $D \times D$ hermitian matrix σ with $\text{Tr } \sigma = 1$ we have:*

$$\sum_k (\text{Tr } \sigma A_k)^2 \equiv \sum_k \langle A_k \rangle_\sigma^2 = \text{Tr } \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{D} \quad (11)$$

Proof: Expanding σ in the basis $\{\mathbb{I}, A_k\}$

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{D} \mathbb{I} + \sum_k r_k A_k \quad (12)$$

we obtain:

$$\sum_k (\text{Tr } \sigma A_k)^2 = \sum_k r_k^2 \quad \text{Tr } \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{D} + \sum_k r_k^2 \quad (13)$$

$\square$

Let us now focus on a single subsystem j and indicate by $D^{(j)}$ the dimension of its Hilbert space. Consider an orthonormal set of $(D^{(j)})^2 - 1$ traceless observables $\{A_k\}$ relative to the j -th subsystem. Whatever the observable $\mathcal{O} \equiv \mathcal{O}^{(j)} \otimes \mathbb{I}^r \in \Omega$ is we can write $\mathcal{O}^{(j)} = \sum_k o_k A_k$, with $\sum_k o_k^2 = 1$. For simplicity, in what follows we write $\mathcal{O}^{(j)} = \hat{\mathbf{o}} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ with $\hat{\mathbf{o}} = (o_1, o_2, \dots)$ and $\mathbf{A} = (A_1, A_2, \dots)$, and denote by $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho$ the vector of components $\langle A_k \rangle_\rho \equiv \text{Tr}(\rho A_k \otimes \mathbb{I}^r)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{(D^{(j)})^2 - 1}$. Exploiting this notation, eq. (3) may be cast in the form

$$R_{\mathcal{O}}^{(j),\mathcal{P}_i}(\rho) = [\hat{\mathbf{o}} \cdot (\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_{\rho_i} - \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho)]^2 \quad (14)$$

Observing that the set Ω can be obtained simply varying the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{o}}$ we may write

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) = \sum_i p_i (\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_{\rho_i} - \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho) \cdot (\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_{\rho_i} - \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho) \quad (15)$$

Taking into consideration the fact that $\rho_i^{(j)}$ is pure and using Lemma 1, we have:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) = 1 - \frac{1}{D^{(j)}} + \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho - 2 \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho \cdot \sum_i p_i \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_{\rho_i} \quad (16)$$

Starting from eq. (1) it's easy to prove that:

$$\sum_i p_i \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_{\rho_i} = \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho \quad (17)$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) = 1 - \frac{1}{D^{(j)}} - \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho \quad (18)$$

Summing up, with the choice (10), the quantities $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ do not depend on the measures $\mathcal{M}^j$ and the maximization in (6) becomes trivial. We wish moreover point out that in view of Lemma 1, $0 \leq \sum_k \langle A_k \rangle_\rho^2 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{D^{(j)}}$. This inequality suggests to rescale $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ as follows $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) \rightarrow (1 - \frac{1}{D^{(j)}})^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho)$ obtaining $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}^j}^{(j)}(\rho) = 1 - \frac{D^{(j)}}{D^{(j)}-1} \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_\rho$. Thus we may define the normalized General Entanglement as:

$$\begin{aligned} E_g(\rho) &= 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \frac{D^{(j)}}{D^{(j)}-1} \langle \mathbf{A}^{(j)} \rangle_\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{A}^{(j)} \rangle_\rho = \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \frac{1}{D^{(j)}-1} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \frac{D^{(j)}}{D^{(j)}-1} \text{Tr}(\rho^{(j)})^2 \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Thus with the choice (10) GE reveals to be related to the average purity of the state, and, when we deal with equal dimensional subsystems it reduces to the generalized global entanglement $E_g^{(1)}$ [4]. Moreover under the choice (10) the GE is surely monotone as proved by the following theorem:

Theorem 3 *General Entanglement is monotone under LOCC if we make the choice (10).*

Proof: In order to prove this statement it is sufficient to demonstrate that $-\sum_j \frac{D^{(j)}}{D^{(j)}-1} \text{Tr}(\rho^{(j)})^2$ does not increase under LOCC. Let us focus on the subsystem j , and consider the bipartition (j - rest of the system). With respect to this bipartition the state admits Schmidt decomposition and, using Schur's theorem [9], it is easy to prove that $\text{Tr}(\rho^{(j)})^2$ is a Schur-convex function of the Schmidt coefficients; then, thanks to Nielsen's majorization theorem [10], $-\text{Tr}(\rho^{(j)})^2$ does not increase under LOCC with respect to the bipartition. But a LOCC with respect to *all* partitions is a LOCC with respect to the fixed bipartition; so $-\sum_j \frac{D^{(j)}}{D^{(j)}-1} \text{Tr}(\rho^{(j)})^2$ is not-increasing under LOCC. $\square$

The ability of writing the General Entanglement $E_g(\rho)$ as expressed by eq. (19) is remarkable not only because it allows us to prove its monotonicity but also in view of

the following considerations. First of all eq. (19) clearly shows that the GE is a linear function of the "average" purity of the state of all the subsystems. Moreover, exploiting the first equality of eq. (19), we may express $E_g(\rho)$ in terms of mean values of local observables. This circumstance is of particular relevance from an experimental point of view giving the possibility of testing directly in laboratory the quantity $E_g(\rho)$ here defined. In what follows we will apply the new concept of GE in order to evaluate the degree of entanglement of assigned multipartite systems. Let's begin considering a system of N spin $\frac{1}{2}$. In correspondence to each subsystem the operators $\hat{S}_x$, S_y , and S_z are traceless and orthogonal each other so that, once normalized they provide the following useful set of operators:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\equiv \sqrt{2}S_z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ A_2 &\equiv \sqrt{2}S_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ A_3 &\equiv \sqrt{2}S_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

with $\hbar = 1$. Exploiting (19), it is immediate to conclude that in the case under scrutiny the degree of multipartite entanglement measured by GE is simply given by

$$E_g(\rho) = 1 - \frac{4}{N} \sum_j \langle \mathbf{S}^{(j)} \rangle^2 \quad (21)$$

This expression coincides with the Meyer-Wallach global entanglement [1, 11, 12] when N qubits are considered. It is of relevance to observe that if $N = 2$ GE can be directly related to the concurrence function C [13] being in particular $E_g(\rho) = C^2(|\psi\rangle)$.

Suppose now that the system of interest is composed by N spins 1. In this case in order to construct the appropriate set of $\{A_k^{(j)}\}$ operators let's start by considering the following linearly independent observables:

$$\begin{aligned} S_z &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} & S_x &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ S_y &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix} & S_{xy} &= S_x S_y + S_y S_x \\ S_{xz} &= S_x S_z + S_z S_x & S_{yz} &= S_y S_z + S_z S_y \\ S_x^2 &= S_x S_x & S_y^2 &= S_y S_y \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Orthonormalizing this set by the Gram-Schmidt method

[14], we obtain the following orthonormal traceless basis:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_z & A_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_x \\
A_3 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_y & A_4 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_{xy} \\
A_5 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_{xz} & A_6 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_{yz} \\
A_7 &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} S_x^2 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \mathbb{I} & A_8 &= \sqrt{2} S_y^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} S_x^2 - \sqrt{2} \mathbb{I}
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Thus (19) becomes:

$$E_g(\rho) = 1 - \frac{3}{2N} \sum_j \langle \mathbf{A}^{(j)} \rangle_\rho^2 \tag{24}$$

As we have previously stressed, GE does not distinguish between “truly” N -partite entanglement [15] and partially separable entanglement. In other words the quantity $E_g(\rho)$ is different from zero also in correspondence to a state separable with respect to some bipartition. It indeed indicates how much *global* entanglement is present in the system. Anyway, if we are interested only in N -partite entanglement, a variant of GE can be introduced. Let us denote by ρ_P the state of the system thought as a bipartite system induced by the bipartition P . Then, the following measure:

$$E_g^N(\rho) = \min \left\{ E_g(\rho), E_g(\rho_P), \forall \text{ bipartition } P \right\} \tag{25}$$

is nonzero if, and only if, the state is N -partite truly entangled, and is less or equal than $E_g(\rho)$. If the system is not too large, the quantity $E_g^N(\rho)$ defined by (25) is simple to compute. In addition it is monotone in view of the fact that a LOCC with respect to all the subsystems is a LOCC with respect to a bipartition.

Summarizing, in this paper we propose a new way to quantify entanglement in multipartite pure systems. In contrast to the Global Entanglement [1] and its generalizations [4], our measure does not require that all the subsystems have the same dimension. Thus GE can be applied to more general physical situations. In addition the measure we propose reveals to be a good one being discriminant, invariant under local unitary operations and monotone under LOCC at least when the normalization

(10) is adopted. Moreover the possibility of expressing GE in terms of mean values of suitable local quantities turns out to be very attractive from the experimental point of view. By definition the quantity we introduce does not allow to distinguish the many ways in which a multipartite system can be entangled. Our aim is indeed to quantify the entanglement present in a multipartite system independently of its distribution. On the other hand the generalization of GE proposed in eq. (25) allows us to distinguish genuine multipartite entangled states. The fundamental aspect of our GE is the fact that it is constructed following a quite simple reasoning based on physical grounds. This directly furnish the possibility of interpreting our function in a clear way. The starting point is that more our physical predictions on a subsystem are changeable acting on the rest of the system, more the subsystem is entangled with the rest. An important result, from the conceptual point of view, is that GE improves, with respect to the notion of monotonicity under LOCC, our capability to *physically* say that a state is more or less entangled than another. In fact, as far as monotonicity, if a state $|\psi\rangle$ can be transformed into $|\phi\rangle$ by LOCC, we physically say that $|\psi\rangle$ is more (or equal) entangled than $|\phi\rangle$. But the order imposed by LOCC is only partial; so, let us consider two states that cannot be converted into each other. We could not physically say that a state is more entangled than the other, if we limit the concept of entanglement to a quantity that does not increase under LOCC. The physical meaning of GE provides a way to compare, on physical basis, the entanglement of such states [16]. Thanks to the fact that GE is monotone, this physical meaning is not in contrast with the commonly accepted fact that entanglement is a quantity that does not increase under LOCC.

Concluding we wish to stress that at least in principle the definition of GE could be extended to the case of infinite-dimensional subsystems, provided that all the involved summations converge. The most delicate point is that the normalization (10) does not work in this case. As far as a possible generalization to statistical mixtures, let us observe that in these cases in order to estimate the degree of entanglement we can take the convex-roof [17] of GE. In other words we can adopt the following quantity $E(\rho) = \inf \sum_i p_i E_g(|\psi_i\rangle)$, where the infimum is taken over all the possible decompositions $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$. However, this quantity is not easily computable, because of the involved extremization.

-
- [1] D.A. Meyer and N.R. Wallach, 2002, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4273
 - [2] Actually, we are dealing with *maximum tests* [3], in the sense that degeneracies are completely removed
 - [3] M. Le Bellac, *Quantum Physics*, §4.1.2, Cambridge, 2006
 - [4] G. Rigolin, T. R. de Oliveira, M. C. de Oliveira, 2006, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 022314

- [5] V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, M.A. Rippin, P.L. Knight, 1997, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275
- [6] G. Vidal, 2000, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355
- [7] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, 2000, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2014
- [8] M.J. Donald, M. Horodecki, O. Rudolph, 2002, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4252

- [9] I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States*, pp. 33-34, Cambridge, 2006
- [10] M.A. Nielsen, 1999, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436
- [11] G.K. Brennen, 2003, Quant. Inf. Comp. **3**, 619
- [12] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh and V. Vedral, 2008, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517
- [13] W.K. Wootters, 1998, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245
- [14] G. Arfken, H. Weber, *Mathematical Methods for Physicists*, 6th ed., §3.1, Academic Press, 2005
- [15] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, 2007, *Quantum entanglement (review)*, §VII.A, arXiv:quant-ph/0702225v2
- [16] From the practical point of view this comparison is made possible by the fact that General Entanglement is simple to compute.
- [17] A. Uhlmann, 1998, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **5**, 209